



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,930	10/07/2003	Viraj Chatterjee	07844/613001/P566	7598
21876	7590	11/28/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. Box 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			NGUYEN, KEVIN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/680,930	CHATTERJEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin M. Nguyen	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/07/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. Claims 18-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter because no useful process is being recited in the claims. The disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility. The examiner has no idea how the software product comprising instructions are operating or what features in the system are causing a data processing apparatus to perform operations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 18, 35-37 and 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arakeri et al (US 6,601,129) hereinafter Arakeri.

4. As to claim 1, Arakeri conventionally discloses a method comprising:

identifying, by a software application in a computer system, display characteristics of multiple display devices [PDA display device and PC display device];
and

generating, by the software application in the computer system, simultaneous independent views of an electronic document on the display devices by separately

Art Unit: 2629

rendering the electronic document to each of display devices based on the identified display characteristics of the device in col. 1, lines 47-63.

5. The limitation of claim 18 is similar to those of claim 1, though in a software product tangibly embodied in a machine-readable medium form, therefore the rejection of claim 18, will be treated using the same rationale as claim 1

6. As to claim 35, figures 1 and 3 of Arakeri discloses a system comprising: one or more peripheral display devices; and a data processing system comprising a primary device and a software application that generates simultaneous independent views of an electronic document on the display devices based display characteristics of the display device as identified by the software application col. 1, lines 47-63 and col. 5, lines 6-32.

7. As to claim 36, as noting in col. 3, lines 8-22, Arakeri further discloses the claimed features of these claims.

8. As to claim 37, as noting in col. 4, lines 38-48, Arakeri further discloses the claimed features of these claims.

9. As to claim 46, Arakeri discloses a system comprising: one or more peripheral display devices; and a data processing system comprising a primary display device and a software application that generates simultaneous independent views of an electronic document on the display devices based on display characteristics of the display device as identified by the software application, wherein a primary view from the independent views includes rendered content not included in a secondary view from the independent views, and the primary view includes at least a portion of a user interface that provides control over the independent views on the display devices both together and separately,

Art Unit: 2629

and the secondary view forms part of a presentation in figures 1 and 3, col. 1, lines 47-63, and col. 5, lines 6-32.

10. As to claim 47, as noting in col. 4, lines 38-48, Arakeri further discloses the claimed features of these claims.

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meyn et al (US 5,859,623).

13. As to claim 48, Meyn teaches a system comprising: software-application-means for accessing an electronic document; and software-application-means for outputting multiple, simultaneous, independent views of the electronic document to different display hardware devices having different screen resolutions and color depths in figure 1, col. 3, lines 9-30, and col. 32, lines 20-31.

14. As to claim 49, as noting in col. 32, lines 20-31, Meyn further discloses the claimed features of these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 2-7, 19-24 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakeri in view of Tafoya et al (US 5,917,480) hereinafter Tafoya.

17. As to claim 2, Arakeri discloses all of the claimed limitation of claim 1, except wherein generating the independent views comprises separately rendering the electronic document according to presentation tags associated with content in the electronic document, the presentation tags indicating device-dependent rendering to be applied to the content based upon assigned device types of the display devices. However, figure 3A of Tafoya teaches that limitation in col. 15, line 66 through col. 16, line 47.

18. As to claim 3, as noting in figures 3A-3C, col. 14, line 58 through col. 15 through col. 16, line 21, Tafoya further discloses the claimed features of these claims.

19. As to claim 4, as noting in col. 16, lines 22-31, Tafoya further discloses the claimed features of these claims.

20. As to claim 5, as noting in col. 1, lines 47-63, Arakeri conventionally discloses the claimed features of these claims.

21. As to claim 6, as noting in col. 16, lines 12-22, Tafoya further discloses the claimed features of these claims.

22. As to claim 7, as noting in col. 16, lines 32-47, Tafoya further discloses the claimed features of these claims.

23. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tafoya into Arakeri to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to modify Arakeri to make the

Art Unit: 2629

presentation tags with content in the electronic document as taught by Tafoya because this would provide a presentation system having a control window that may be invoked while the presentation system is in the slide-show mode (see Tafoya, col. 3, lines 51-67).

24. The limitation of claims 19-24 are the same as those of claims 2-7 and therefore the claims will be rejected using the same rationale.

25. As to claim 41, Arakeri discloses all of the claimed limitation of claim 35, except wherein the software application concurrently renders the electronic document multiple times according to presentation tags associated with content in the electronic document, the presentation tags indicating device-dependent rendering to be applied to the electronic document. However, figure 3A of Tafoya teaches that limitation in col. 15, line 66 through col. 16, line 47.

26. As to claim 42, as noting in col. 1, lines 47-63, Arakeri conventionally discloses the claimed features of these claims.

27. As to claim 43, as noting in col. 5, lines 6-33, Arakeri and Tafoya discloses the claimed features of these claims.

28. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tafoya into Arakeri to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to modify Arakeri to make the presentation tags with content in the electronic document as taught by Tafoya because this would provide a presentation system having a control window that may be invoked

Art Unit: 2629

while the presentation system is in the slide-show mode (see Tafoya, col. 3, lines 51-67).

29. Claims 8-17 and 25-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakeri in view of Tofoya as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Meyn et al (US 5,859,623) hereinafter Meyn.

30. As to claim 8, the combination of Arakeri and Tofoya teaches all of the claimed limitation, except wherein obtaining the display characteristics comprises obtaining screen resolution and color depth information of the multiple display devices. However, Meyn teaches that limitation in col. 32, lines 20-31.

31. As to claim 9, as noting in col. 1, lines 47-63, Arakeri conventionally discloses the claimed features of these claims.

32. As to claim 10, Arakeri teaches a PDA display device. It would have been obvious to recognize that the PDA display device being displayed without color. Meyn teaches the projector being displayed with color.

33. As to claim 11-16, as noting in figure 3, col. 1, lines 47-63, and col. 5, lines 6-32, Arakeri conventionally discloses and teaches the claimed features of these claims.

34. As to claim 17, as noting in col. 10, lines 50-55, Arakeri discloses the claimed features of these claims.

35. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Meyn into Arakeri and Tofoya to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to modify the combination of Arakeri and Tofoya to make screen resolution and color depth information of the

Art Unit: 2629

multiple display devices as taught by Meyn because this would improve the quality of the image being displayed without requiring the separate computer and cables (see Meyn, col. 1, lines 53-63).

36. The limitation of claims 25-29 are the same as those of claims 8-12 respectively and therefore the claims will be rejected using the same rationale.

37. The limitation of claims 31-34 are the same as those of claims 14-17 respectively and therefore the claims will be rejected using the same rationale.

38. The limitation of claim 30 is the same as that of claim 13 and therefore the claims will be rejected using the same rationale.

39. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakeri as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Meyn et al (US 5,859,623) hereinafter Meyn.

40. As to claim 38, Arakeri teaches all of the claimed limitation, except wherein the display characteristics comprises screen resolution and color depth information. However, Meyn teaches that limitation in col. 32, lines 20-31.

41. As to claim 39, as noting in figure 3, col. 1, lines 47-63, and col. 5, lines 6-32, Arakeri conventionally discloses and teaches the claimed features of these claims.

42. As to claim 40, Arakeri teaches a PDA display device. It would have been obvious to recognize that the PDA display device being displayed without color. Meyn teaches the projector being displayed with color.

43. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Meyn into Arakeri to create the

Art Unit: 2629

claimed invention. It would have been obvious to modify Arakeri to make screen resolution and color depth information of the multiple display devices as taught by Meyn because this would improve the quality of the image being displayed without requiring the separate computer and cables (see Meyn, col. 1, lines 53-63).

44. Claims 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arakeri as applied to claim 35 above, and in view of Meyn et al (US 5,859,623) hereinafter Meyn.

Arakeri teaches all of the claimed limitation, except wherein the electronic document comprises an electronic in a predetermined final format that defines an appearance of the electronic document, and wherein the predetermined final format comprises PDF. However, Meyn teaches that limitation in col. 10, lines 49-67. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Meyn into Arakeri to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to modify Arakeri to make the predetermined final format comprises PDF as taught by Meyn because this would improve the quality of the image being displayed without requiring the separate computer and cables (see Meyn, col. 1, lines 53-63).


Conclusion

45. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN M. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-7697. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THU from 8:00-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, a supervisor RICHARD A. HJERPE can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8000.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the Patent Application Information Retrieval system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Kevin M. Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2629

KMN
November 22, 2006